

Remarks

As a preliminary matter, as a courtesy to the Office, a fully translated copy of DE 19952998 ("Exner") is supplied herewith, to be placed in the file and used in reference to the remarks made below.

The drawings were objected to as not showing the features of claim 61 and corrected drawing sheets were required. In response, a new Fig. 6 is supplied herewith including the features of claim 61 in addition to amendments to the specification to support the new drawing. Applicant notes that the new figure is a schematic representation of the embodiment. If the Examiner has the opinion that the objection is not satisfied with the enclosed drawing, the Applicant can supply a revised Fig. 6. No new matter is being introduced.

In response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Fig. 2 of Exner shows a process chamber 2 having sub-chambers. Sub-chambers 3a and 3b form the construction spaces and sub-chambers 4a and 4b form powder reservoirs. In the lower part of Fig. 2, there is shown a cover plate 7b and top plate 5 having a window 6b. As is described on page 15, in lines 7-10 of the English translation of Exner (see attachment), a doctor is mounted at one edge of the cover plate for applying a powder layer in the construction spaces. As is described in the third step on page 15, by a turn of the cover plates powder is shifted from the supply containers (or reservoirs) 4a, 4b into the construction spaces 3a, 3b. Therefore, the cover plate together with the doctor resembles a powder application device.

However, such a powder application device is not moved while there is a solidification of powder material.

Powder may be solidified by energetic radiation entering the construction space (e.g., 3b) through coupling-in window 6b arranged in top plate 5. However, there is no indication in Exner that the cover plates are moved during the solidification of the powder. Rather, from steps 1 to 5 described on page 15 of the translation (enclosed) it seems that the cover plates are stationary during the fourth step, in which a solidification of the powder takes place in the construction spaces.

Accordingly, during the interconnection of an applied layer to a layer, which has been applied before, the material application device is not moved with respect to an already applied layer. Furthermore, there is also no movement of the bottoms 9a, 9c of the construction spaces during the fourth step. The latter would also make no sense, as this would lower the preciseness of the solidified shape. For these reasons, Exner cannot anticipate the claims.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Masters does not disclose any layerwise material application. In particular, as is shown in Fig. 4 of Masters, Masters is directed to the coordination of the material application (the material is applied in a line) with the movement of the table 42. Also, in Masters, solidification occurs immediately after the application of the material. Such a procedure is not performed in devices where there is a layerwise material application. Finally, in Masters, there is no powder used as building material. As a result, it is not obvious to combine Masters with Exner, and even if one were to do so, the claimed invention would not result from the combination, at least because of the deficiencies of Exner set out above. Therefore, the claims are not rendered obvious by the Exner and Masters.

Reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Dated: August 5, 2009

By: /Steven B. Courtright/
Steven B. Courtright
Patent Agent
Reg. No. 40,966